



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,614	11/10/2003	James F. Hainfeld	16049Z	4692
23389 7590 08/27/2008 SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530				
EXAMINER HOPKINS, CHRISTINE D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3735				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/27/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/705,614	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HAINFELD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS	<b>Art Unit</b> 3735	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS. (3) Charles Marmor, II.  
 (2) Xiaochun Zhu, Reg. No. 56,311. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 69.

Identification of prior art discussed: Esenaliev (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,440), Patel (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0180917).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the interpretation given by the Examiner with respect to claim 69 was unreasonable based on the claim language. The Examiner indicated that a new search would be conducted upon formal submission, and entry of, the proposed amendment to claim 69.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Charles A. Marmor, II/ SPE, Art Unit 3735
--	---